



## **Texas Department of Insurance**

### **Division of Workers' Compensation**

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • [www.tdi.texas.gov](http://www.tdi.texas.gov)

## **MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION**

### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

#### **Requestor Name and Address**

SAN ANTONIO ACCIDENT INJURY CARE  
26907 GLENFILED HOLLOW LANE  
CYPRESS TX 77433

#### **Respondent Name**

ILLINOIS NATIONAL INSURANCE CO

#### **Carrier's Austin Representative**

Box Number 19

#### **MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-11-2786-01

#### **MFDR Date Received**

APRIL 14, 2011

### **REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY**

**Requestor's Position Summary:** "The treating doctor is Dr. Richard Alexander and the doctor who preformed the emg is Dr. Curtis Cook. There does NOT need to be the surgeons name anywhere if the treating dr is Dr.Alexander."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$3,019.00

### **RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY**

**Respondent's Position Summary:** "The issue of chiropractic scope of practice regarding a Needle EMG has been decided by Stephen Yelenosky, Judge, 345<sup>th</sup> District Court, and Travis County, Texas...thereby finding that a doctor of chiropractic is not permitted to be reimbursed for a needle EMG under the Texas WC Statute."

**Response Submitted By:** Chartis

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
June 11, 2010	CPT Code 95861	\$315.00	\$0.00
	CPT Code 95900-59 (X4)	\$732.00	\$0.00
	CPT Code 95903 (X4)	\$752.00	\$366.05
	CPT Code 95904 (X5)	\$750.00	\$343.25
	CPT Code 95934 (X2)	\$200.00	\$145.55
	CPT Code 99241	\$120.00	\$0.00
	HCPCS Code A4215	\$60.00	\$0.00
	HCPCS Code A4213	\$60.00	\$0.00

June 11, 2010	HCPCS Code A4556	\$30.00	\$0.00
TOTAL		\$3,019.00	\$854.85

### ***FINDINGS AND DECISION***

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

#### **Background**

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203, effective March 1, 2008, 33 *Texas Register* 364, sets the reimbursement guidelines for the disputed service.
3. 22 Texas Administrative Code §75, effective December 24, 2009, 34 *Texas Register* 9208, sets out the scope of practice for chiropractors.
4. District Court of Travis County, 250<sup>th</sup> Judicial District No. D-1-N-GN-06-003451, Honorable Stephen Yelenosky, Judge Presiding, Order on cross-motions for partial summary judgment dated November 24, 2009.
5. Texas Court of Appeals, Third District at Austin, NO. 03-10-00673-CV, Opinion dated April 5, 2012.
6. Texas Court of Appeals, Third District at Austin, NO. 03-10-00673-CV, Mandate dated August 8, 2013.
7. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

#### Explanation of benefits

- 185-The rendering provider is not eligible to perform the service billed.
- V190-This surgeon's name does not appear on operative report-records received.
- VH04-Service does not fall within the scope of the providers practice.
- VA07-This service/supply is not covered according to the state fee schedule guideline.
- X394-Our position remains the same if you disagree with our decision please contact the TWCC Medical Dispute Resolution
- Z656-Any request for reconsideration of this workers' compensation payment should be accompanied by a copy of this explanation of review.

#### **Litigation Background for Needle EMG and MUA**

Portions of the Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners rules of practice were challenged by the Texas Medical Association and the Texas Medical Board in 2009. At issue was whether 22 Texas Administrative Code §75.17(a)(3), (c)(2)(D), (c)(3)(A), and (e)(2)(O) were within the scope of chiropractic practice in Texas. Specifically, the parties sought judgment on whether rules allowing Chiropractors to perform needle electromyography (EMG) and manipulation under anesthesia (MUA) were valid. On November 24, 2009, the 345th District Court issued a judgment in which presiding judge Honorable Stephen Yelenosky concluded that needle EMG and MUA exceeded the statutory scope of chiropractic practice in Texas. The Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners appealed the district court's judgment to the Texas Court of Appeals, Third District. The Texas Court of Appeals in *Tex. Bd. Of Chiropractic Examiners v. Tex. Med. Ass'n.*, 375 S.W.3d 464 (Tex. App. – Austin, 2012, pet. den.) issued an opinion affirming the district court's judgment, and concluding that needle EMG and MUA services are not within the chiropractic scope-of-practice. The Chiropractic Board exhausted its appeals and on August 8, 2013, the mandate affirming the district court's judgment was issued. The mandate states "...we affirm the remainder of the district court's judgment that subparts 75.17(a)(3), (c)(2)(D), (c)(3)(A), and (e)(2)(O) of the Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners' scope-of-practice rule are void." In accordance with the Texas Court of Appeals opinion, the final mandate, and the scope of chiropractic practice requirement in 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(6), needle EMG and MUA services may not be reimbursed.

#### **Issues**

1. Is the rendering provider eligible to perform needle electromyography?
2. Is the rendering provider eligible to perform nerve conduction tests?
3. Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement for CPT code 95900?
4. Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement for CPT code 95934, 95903, and 95904?
5. Is the rendering provider eligible to perform an office consultation?
6. Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement for the office consultation?
7. Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement for HCPCS codes A4215, A4213 and A4556?

## Findings

1. CPT code 95861 is defined as "Needle electromyography; 2 extremities with or without related paraspinal areas." According to the medical documentation found, this service was performed by Curtis Cook, D.C. (Doctor of Chiropractic). The Texas Court of Appeals in *Tex. Bd. Of Chiropractic Examiners v. Tex. Med. Ass'n.*, 375 S.W.3d 464 (Tex. App. – Austin, 2012, pet. den.) issued an opinion affirming the district court's judgment, and concluding that needle EMG and MUA services are not within the chiropractic scope-of-practice of chiropractors. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(6) states "Notwithstanding Medicare payment policies, chiropractors may be reimbursed for services provided within the scope of their practice act." The division finds that disputed service code 95861 is not within the scope of chiropractic practice because it is an electro-diagnostic test that involves the insertion of a needle into the patient. Therefore, no reimbursement can be recommended for CPT code 95861 pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(6).
2. Disputed services 95900, 95903, 95904, and 95934 fall in the category of nerve conduction tests under applicable AMA current procedural terminology (CPT). These tests involve placing a stimulating electrode is directly over the nerve to be tested. These are surface tests that do not involve needles. According to the medical documentation found, these services were performed by Curtis Cook, D.C. (Doctor of Chiropractic). As stated in the Texas Court of Appeals, Third District at Austin, NO. 03-10-00673-CV, Opinion dated April 5, 2012

In the second provision, paragraph(c)(3)(A), TBCE imposed certification and supervision requirements on any licenses who administered "electro-neuro diagnostic testing" that varied according to whether the testing was "surface (non-needle)" or involved the use of needles. The import or effect of paragraphs (c)(2)(D) and (c)(3)(A), as the parties agree, was that chiropractors with specified training and certification could utilize needle EMG in evaluating or examining patients. In their live petitions and summary-judgment motions, the Physician Parties challenged the validity of the two rule provisions **specifically addressing needle EMG** [emphasis added]- 75.17(c)(2)(D) and (c)(3)(A) – plus the general standard regarding use of needles-75.17(a)(3)."

That is, surface tests were not in question during this suit. Pursuant to §75.17(c)(3)(A) effective December 24, 2009, 34 Texas Register 9208, services 95900, 95903, 95904, and 95934 are within the scope of chiropractic practice because they are surface tests. Reimbursement is recommended for these services.

3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(5), states "'Medicare payment policies' when used in this section, shall mean reimbursement methodologies, models, and values or weights including its coding, billing, and reporting payment policies as set forth in the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) payment policies specific to Medicare."

Per The National Correct Coding Initiative Policy Manual "The NCCI edit with column one CPT code 95903 (Motor nerve conduction studies with F-wave study, each nerve) and column two CPT code 95900 (Motor nerve conduction studies without F-wave study, each nerve) is often bypassed by utilizing modifier 59. Use of modifier 59 with the column two CPT code 95900 of this NCCI edit is appropriate only if the two procedures are performed on different nerves or at separate patient encounters." The requestor utilized modifier 59 to indicate that CPT code 95900 was a separate procedure. A review of the submitted report, does not support that motor testing nerves were different than the F-Wave study nerves or a separate patient encounter; therefore, reimbursement is not recommended.

4. Because these studies, CPT codes 95934, 95903, and 95904, are within the scope of chiropractic practice reimbursement is recommended in accordance with 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(c).

Per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(c)(1)(2), "To determine the MAR for professional services, system participants shall apply the Medicare payment policies with minimal modifications.

(1) For service categories of Evaluation & Management, General Medicine, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Radiology, Pathology, Anesthesia, and Surgery when performed in an office setting, the established conversion factor to be applied is \$52.83. For Surgery when performed in a facility setting, the established conversion factor to be applied is \$66.32.

(2) The conversion factors listed in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be the conversion factors for calendar year 2008. Subsequent year's conversion factors shall be determined by applying the annual percentage adjustment of the Medicare Economic Index (MEI) to the previous year's conversion factors, and shall be effective January 1st of the new calendar year. The following hypothetical example illustrates this annual adjustment activity if the Division had been using this MEI annual percentage adjustment: The 2006 Division conversion factor of \$50.83 (with the exception of surgery) would have been multiplied by the 2007 MEI annual percentage increase of 2.1 percent, resulting in the \$51.90 (with the exception of surgery) Division conversion factor in 2007."

To determine the MAR the following formula is used: (DWC Conversion Factor/Medicare Conversion Factor) X Participating Amount = Maximum Allowable Reimbursement (MAR).

The 2010 DWC conversion factor for this service is 54.32.

The Medicare Conversion Factor is 36.8729

Review of Box 32 on the CMS-1500 the services were rendered in zip code 78209, which is located in San Antonio, Texas. Therefore, the Medicare participating amount will be based on the reimbursement for Rest of Texas.

Using the above formula, the Division finds the following:

Code	Calculation for Locality Rest of Texas	Maximum Allowable
95903	$(54.32/36.8729) \times \$62.12$ for 4 Units	\$366.05
95904	$(54.32/36.8729) \times \$46.60$ for 5 Units	\$343.25
95934	$(54.32/36.8729) \times \$49.40$ for 2 Unit	\$145.55
		\$854.85

5. Disputed service 99241 is an office consultation for a new or established patient. According to the medical documentation found, this service was performed by Curtis Cook, D.C. (Doctor of Chiropractic). The workers' compensation carrier denied payment because 185-The rendering provider is not eligible to perform the service billed. 22 Texas Administrative Code §75.17(c)(2)(A) states "Examination and Evaluation: (1) In the practice of Chiropractic, licensees of this board provide necessary examination and evaluation of services." The Division finds that 99241 is within the chiropractic scope of practice in Texas. The carriers' denial is not supported.
6. The fee guideline applicable to evaluation and management services including the office consultation in dispute is 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203, Titled *Medical Fee Guideline for Professional Services*. In the absence of a contracted rate, the reimbursement for a professional service, including an evaluation and management service, is established under paragraph (c). §134.203 (c) states "To determine the MAR for professional services, system participants shall apply the Medicare payment policies with minimal modifications. The term "Medicare payment policy" is defined for this rule by §134.203 (a)(5). The definition includes billing the correct codes as specified by Medicare.

The Medicare billing policy applicable to the disputed service can be found at [www.cms.gov](http://www.cms.gov) in the CMS Manual System Pub 100-04 Medicare Claims Processing, Transmittal 1875, Change Request (CR) 6740, dated December 14, 2009, effective January 1, 2010. CR#6740 states that the use of all consultation codes (ranges 99241-99245 and 99251-99255) was eliminated effective January 1, 2010. In lieu of consultation codes, participants were directed to use codes 99201-99205 that identify the complexity of the visit performed. The eliminated codes include 99244 which the requestor reported on its medical bills.

The division concludes that the requestor failed to code the office consultation in dispute in accordance with the applicable Medicare policy in effect on the date the service in dispute was provided, thereby failing to meet the correct coding requirements of §133.20(c), and §134.203 (b)(1). For that reason, no reimbursement can be recommended.

7. On the disputed date of service, the requestor billed HCPCS codes A4215, A4213 and A4556. The respondent denied reimbursement based upon reason codes "185." This denial is not supported. The disputed services will be reviewed per applicable Division rules and guidelines.

Per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(5), the Division will use Medicare payment policies. Per Medicare policy, HCPCS codes A4556 are bundled codes and payment allowance is included in another service. In addition, HCPCS codes A4213 and A4215 are not covered by Medicare in any payment system; therefore, reimbursement is not recommended.

## **Conclusion**

For the reasons stated above, the Division finds that the requestor has established that reimbursement is due for the specified services. As a result, the amount ordered is \$854.85.

## ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code Sections 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute. The Division hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor the amount of \$854.85 plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this Order.

### Authorized Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

10/04/2013  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**